



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_12701
Title of the Manuscript:	Development & Evaluation of Amylase Rich Malted Mixes (ARMMS) to Improve the Nutritional & Health Status of Pre School Children
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Revise your abstract please. Describe your methods well, how did you do the analysis before the result you presented. Also you need to conclude well in your abstract. What method really did you use for your sensory evaluation? Was it 5 point hedonic scale or 4. Your options were it only "good" and "very good"? no option for bad, very bad etc?????? INTRODUCTION: This section is empty. No references, no review on development, evaluation, amylase rich malted mixes Nutritional & Health Status of PreSchool Children. You need to do a brief review on your keywords before stating the objective of the study. METHODOLOGY The methodology will be better when you section it and state the details/steps for your analysis. Some of the reference here are too old, 1965 and 1947!!!! RESULT: The tables are meant to have 3 lines not in the "block" the way you left it. The analysis of your organoleptic	Modified the abstract. Yes. Modified the conclusions. 5 point hedonic scale. Modified I do agree. These are the standard methods. The over all acceptability is high (4.75-



SDI Review Form 1.6

	can be subjected to ANOVA to compare means>>>>. REFERENCES All the references were not properly done. Check the journal guideline and follow please. Also the references are too old, update please.	5.0) not subjected to ANOVA Corrected & arranged in alphabetical order.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a very good work but let the author revise the paper as stated, then you can publish.	Attended corrections / modified.